



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## THE EDITOR'S DIARY.

---

MONDAY, *October 22.*

Intuition the American Guide.

WE are an amusing people. Witness our treatment of men who have become popular idols, suddenly raised to the pinnacle only to be dropped overnight into comparative oblivion! Instances of this character, exhibiting apparent, though not, in our judgment, real, inconsistency are so recent and familiar that they need not be cited. The latest, however, affords occasion for curious and interesting speculation. A statesman who had achieved unique fame by serving twice as a great political party's candidate for the Presidency left his native land for a stay of many months in foreign countries in search of information and recreation, both of which we suspect he needed, and both of which we are quite certain he obtained. His departure was of so little importance as to be hardly noted in the public journals, but during his absence the whirligig of successive events made of him a colossal figure, and shortly before his return the apparently sagacious remark was ventured that only two living men could prevent his elevation to the Presidency, one being our present Chief Magistrate and the other himself.

The time of his return seemed altogether propitious and the welcome extended him was as impressive as any ever beheld in this land. Inspired by the seeming acceptance and endorsement of his theories of government, which previously had been scorned and repudiated, he saw an opportunity to blaze a new and yet more popular way in precise parallel with those paths originally indicated by himself which had at last apparently won general approval. He thereupon expressed the opinion in no strident way, but rather tentatively, that the time would come when it would be desirable for the Federal Government to take over, presumably by purchase, the great railway systems of the country and to operate

them in the equitable interest of the whole people. It was not a revolutionary proposal. Nearly every other large nation has engaged more or less successfully in the same work and our own Government from the very beginning has directly managed the great and growing business of transmitting letters, newspapers, magazines and merchandise on the broadest and largest scale in the world. So far as one could perceive, moreover, the restive people seemed eager to welcome this explicit suggestion. With what amazement, then, must this statesman have beheld the instantaneous rejection, not merely of the proposal itself, but apparently of himself and all his works! His purpose upon returning home was to lead a mighty campaign to drive the present controlling influence in Congress from power. That he is even now more or less actively engaged in this undertaking we understand to be the fact, but his utterances have ceased to make so much as ripples upon the surface of public interest, and, indeed, are no longer printed and scarcely referred to in the public journals.

How is this abrupt reversal of the attitude of an entire people to be accounted for? If a fundamental principle or a cherished tradition had been threatened, the explanation would be easy and transparent. But, as we have pointed out, that was not the case. Nor theoretically is there anything alarming in so cautious a declaration. Our own predilections against radicalism in any form are strong and deep-seated, and yet we do not hesitate to express frank agreement with the proposition that such a time may be reached in the course of the development of the country. No moral law or traditional policy would be violated. Whether or not or at what political stage in our national career, if ever, the Government should assume the responsibility of general railway management is a simple question of business. That the day has not yet arrived is evident. Our greatest accumulator of material possessions through industrial endeavor, whose words of wisdom because of his very achievements often pass unheeded, spoke the simple truth when the other day he declared that as a people we must for many years continue to be builders rather than conservers. The enormous task of affording opportunities and providing homes for two or three hundred millions of population within our present borders has hardly begun. To make possible the utilization of millions of acres, at present only waste

places, probably a hundred thousand miles of new railways must be constructed during the next fifty years. The bitter experience of our Government in opening the way to the Pacific Coast, no less than the marvellous progression of railway construction through private endeavor, conclusively proves that this can be accomplished best by individual enterprise and energy. To check a growth which will soon become a positive necessity would be obvious folly. There are other and many reasons equally practical and potent, though of less serious moment, why acquisition of the railways by the Government would at this time be unwise, but the definite and almost universal rejection of the idea renders their consideration unnecessary.

The interesting question we have in mind is, How did the people so speedily reach a decision? There was no shock, as we have said, from principle or policy, and there had been practically no discussion of the business aspects of the proposition. Even such a marshalling of facts as might have resulted in unfavorable conclusions from the view-point of logic and reason had not been attempted. What, then, is left as the influencing and determining element except keen intuition that such a project would be ill-advised and that its sponsor therefore must be an unsafe guide? On the whole, we are disposed to think that it is this quality, characteristic of femininity, that makes and unmakes our heroes and plays a large part in shaping our national destiny. If this be indeed the case, it is a comforting reflection that one would experience great difficulty in finding an instance of error in the instinctive perception of the American people.

---

TUESDAY, *October 23.*

For a New National Hymn.

WILL not some one kindly compose a new national hymn? We should dislike to lose "The Star-spangled Banner" chiefly because of its patriotic origin on board an American frigate during a British bombardment, and we love to recall such incidents as that in Castle Garden, when Daniel Webster, to the distress of his wife, and the delight of the audience, set the example of rising, which has since become common, and, by main strength and with mighty voice, joining in the chorus with Jenny Lind. But, after all, only the words are American, the atrocious music being that of "Anacreon in Heaven," composed by an Englishman. It is therefore distinctively national only in part,

and after nearly a century of trying service might well be laid upon the shelf. A yet more efficient reason for seeking a substitute is found in the fact that the American people have been trying in vain for nearly a century to sing it. Despite the general cultivation of voices, the endeavor of an audience to-day to respond to the demand upon their patriotic spirit continues to be as pathetic as it has ever been desperate. Even our loyal navy takes "America" in place of "The Star-spangled Banner" at evening colors. From time to time the suggestion is made that this substitution be generally made, but here again objection arises from the fact that only the words of "America," too, are American. On British ocean steamships a prior right is tacitly accorded to the British, and "God Save the King" is sung. While we persist in adherence to "The Star-spangled Banner," it is fitting that this recognition should be extended to our British cousins, although as a matter of fact their claim upon the air for a national hymn is no stronger than ours and materially weaker than that of others. It was composed by the Frenchman Lully in the seventeenth century, was adapted to the House of Hanover by Handel and promptly taken over by Switzerland for "Rufst du, mein Vaterland" although the Hanoverians never abandoned it, "Heil dir im Siegerkranz," not "Die Wacht am Rhein," being to this day the national hymn of Germany. Consequently, the eve-song of British, Swiss, German and American soldiers about to go into battle would consist of the same music and a jumble of words by Carey, Harries, Rev. Samuel F. Smith and whoever wrote the Swiss words. For double-quick marching "Yankee Doodle" continues to be satisfactory and "Hail, Columbia" is not without merit; but "America" is of too common use among the nations and "The Star-spangled Banner" too throat-rending; so again we ask, Will not some one kindly present us with a new distinctively American national hymn?

---

WEDNESDAY, *October 24.*

Of Obstinacy in Conversation.

WE seem to perceive, especially among women, a growing disposition to regard intellectual obstinacy as a valuable adjunct of conversation and to exercise it accordingly. The method is simple. One merely makes a practice of emphatically denying the assertion or deduction of any other, thereby enforcing immediate elucidation, of whose necessity there has been no antici-

pation and for which preparation is naturally lacking. It is a convenient and, if unexpected, an effective way of shifting the burden of proof in such a manner as to profit shrewdness at the expense of wisdom. The resultant irritation, familiar to all who have and express opinions of their own, we frankly admit not only to have felt ourselves but to have noted with inward glee in others. This fact alone sufficing to stamp the process as being unworthy as it is obviously unintellectual, the tendency, if our premise be correct, merits consideration.

Judgments respecting the value of mere disputation or, as we prefer to term it, mental obstinacy, differ widely. Plato entirely prohibited the exercise to "weak" or "ill-descended" minds, and Montaigne—after declaring that "we only learn to dispute that we may contradict; and, every one contradicting and being contradicted, it falls out that the fruit of disputation is to lose and nullify truth"—tacitly assents when he demands "To what end do you go about to inquire of him who knows nothing to purpose?" This, however, savors not only of rare petulance, but even of the sly inconsistency of Mark Twain's recent dictum in this REVIEW that he admires criticism—if it is his way; because in no other place did the great French philosopher waver from his positive declaration that "contradictions do neither offend nor alter, but only rouse and exercise me." Recognizing a presumptive truth in the elder Cato's observation that "the wise may learn more from the fools than the fools from the wise," he professes to admire "stout expressions amongst gallant men," irrespective of the merit of the utterances or the intellectual quality of those speaking; he values only "the friendship that flatters itself in the sharpness and vigor of its communication, as love, in biting and scratching; it is not vigorous and generous enough if it be not quarrelsome, if civilized and artificial, if it treads nicely and fears a shock."

Such are the brave words of the great man, but, alas! they ring as untrue as his accounts of amours, which lived only in his imagination, and are completely confuted by his subsequent naïve assertion: "When any one contradicts me, he raises my attention, not my anger; I advance towards him that controverts me, as to one that instructs me; the cause of truth ought to be the common cause of both; what will he answer?" Sincerity flies out of the window; policy enters the door. Less qualified yielding to the

detestable Socratic method of setting traps for the unwary could not be imagined. Even our own canny Franklin was more ingenuous when, gleefully recounting his discovery of the art in Xenophon's *Memorabilia*, he wrote:

"I was charmed with it, adopted it, dropt my abrupt contradiction and positive argumentation, and put on the humble inquirer and doubter. And being then, from reading Shaftesbury and Collins, become a real doubter in many points of our religious doctrine, I found this method safest for myself and very embarrassing to those against whom I used it. Therefore, I took a delight in it, practised it continually, and grew very artful and expert in drawing people, even of superior knowledge, into concessions, the consequences of which they did not foresee, entangling them in difficulties out of which they could not extricate themselves, and so obtaining victories that neither myself nor my cause always deserved.

"I continued this method some few years, but gradually left it, retaining only the habit of expressing myself in terms of modest diffidence; never using, when I advanced anything that may possibly be disputed, the words 'certainly,' 'undoubtedly,' or any others that give the air of positiveness to an opinion; but rather say, I 'conceive' or 'apprehend' a thing to be so and so; 'it appears to me,' or 'I should think' it so and so, for such and such reasons; or I 'imagine' it to be so; or it is so, 'if I am not mistaken.'

"This habit, I believe, has been of great advantage to me when I have had occasion to inculcate my opinions and persuade men into measures that I have been from time to time engaged in promoting."

The cross-questioning of Socrates, the silly pretence of Montaigne and the crafty caution of Franklin, as combined in the method of those who display what we have termed obstinacy in their conversation, suffice to try the patience of a saint; and yet we cannot deny that the extreme contrary is equally unworthy and obnoxious. We are driven, therefore, to inquire whether there may not be a complete divergence from both which would have the seeming of a happy medium? If, for example, one be neither hatefully disputatious for effect nor hypocritically humble from policy, but frank, natural and wholly honest in both word and mind, is there not a reasonable probability that the impression made upon others would be as agreeable as they have a right to expect?

---

THURSDAY, October 25.

The Helpfulness of Fishing.

ABILITY to cast a fly has so long been recognized as the chief requisite of a true fisherman that those who profess to be sports-

men are prone to shrug their shoulders at mention of one who merely angles; and yet the great Izaak himself, whose rambling dialogue, "sweetening the temper of any man who reads it," has become a classic, was so ignorant of the more delicate art that a friend was called to make discourse thereon in the "compleat" book. We are probably justified, then, in assuming that there are two sides of the argument, the decision depending chiefly upon the purpose held in view. To one seeking active sport the lithe rod and shrewdly selected imitation of a familiar insect are essential, but to the philosopher seeking opportunity for reflection, the troll, the bob or the amiable worm meets every necessity.

One of our most exemplary citizens, chiefly distinguished from having twice served as Chief Magistrate of the Nation, uses the bob sturdily and skilfully, yet withal so considerately as to have achieved no small measure of popularity beneath the surface of the waters. It is this method of fishing that affords the widest range for meditation, and we are pleased to observe that some of the thoughts that have come to him in the intervals of waiting he has seen fit to set down for publication in a book, the reading of which is a delight, especially if one permit one's imagination to depict the conditions attendant upon specific reflections. For example: "Fishing stories are always to be believed" brings before the mental vision the inevitable doubter of the sad truth that "the biggest fish are always lost"; a clear conscience ensuing from stern resistance of temptation clearly appears in "It is better to go home with nothing killed than to feel the weight of a mean, unsportsmanlike act"; unconscious disapprobation of certain political methods may be suspected from "The unstrenuous, philosophical fishing fraternity does more good for humanity than the strenuous people"; and, finally, a plea for leisure as a cure for present evils is plainly manifest in "There can be no doubt that the promise of industrial business, of contented labor and of healthful moderation in the pursuit of wealth, in this democratic country of ours, would be infinitely improved if a larger share of the time which has been devoted to the concoctions of trusts and business combinations had been spent in fishing." Here speaks the statesman as well as the philosopher, the man of experience and affairs no less than the calm, dispassionate observer of current tendencies.



It is well, indeed, as Doctor Prime would say, to go a-fishing when one may catch such helpful thoughts, but better far and vastly more profitable to the jaded mind and worn conscience is the inestimable privilege of renewing acquaintance with one's self amid the singing of the birds and the sighing of the trees. Such, in considering the true need of the American man, we suspect to have been the feeling, though unexpressed, of our worthy sage.

---

FRIDAY, October 26.

"In Times of Peace."

WE had better make up our minds now than later that our friends the Japanese will become more and more pestiferous as the years roll by. That is an inevitable consequence of the condition incited by Great Britain for political purposes and sustained by those of ourselves who justly entertain a feeling of antipathy against Russia. That the present Government of Japan is sane and sober is manifest, but there seems every reason to believe that its restraint is wholly diplomatic and in no sense representative of the temper of the people. This is but natural. History bears no record of a speedy and unexpected communal triumph failing to induce self-confidence, sensitive notions of dignity and lust of recognition and even at times of authority. Alexander and Cæsar only personified the demands of those who had made their victories possible, and they would have been as helpless in cautious resistance to these demands as Napoleon himself would have been, had his temperament been such as to withstand the frenzy of France for replacement among the aristocracies of Europe. So in Japan to-day the rulers must reckon with a people becoming daily more restive in resentment of evidences of the indisposition of civilized nations to recognize in them specific rights, which they believe and firmly insist that they won by proven skill in warfare with a great Power.

In view of these circumstances it is not surprising to hear reports of an "Anti-American" outburst in Japan. Its immediate cause is of comparatively little importance, natural jealousy and desire to demonstrate even greater capacity quite sufficing to account for it; and yet it is interesting to note the shrewdness with which the most vulnerable spot in our national armor is selected for attack. We know and of course everybody else knows that, while receiving hordes of unwelcome beings from Europe, we

have been extremely chary of admitting those seeking entrance through our Western ports, and long ago, to serve the personal political ambition of a perennial candidate for the Presidency, we placed an embargo upon the Chinese. California in such matters was the dominant factor then and necessarily from geographical position is now. To her residents, therefore, accustomed as they have been for these many years to treat representatives of the "yellow peril" in their own sweet way, it was only casually incidental recently to enact that thereafter all children of Oriental descent should be excluded from public schools and compelled to study in places especially designated for them. The Chinese and Koreans meekly submitted as usual, but the Japanese official representative, after making an ineffectual protest, notified his people at home to such purpose that, despite the resistance of the Government, newspapers and assemblages have indulged in denunciation so vigorous that, according to a trustworthy correspondent, "a prompt repudiation of the anti-Japanese sentiment by the United States at large is necessary to avert a crisis here that would result in the destruction of the historic friendly political, financial and commercial relations between the two nations."

Whether or not this description of the state of mind in Japan is exaggerated, we can readily perceive a possible seriousness in the situation because of the underlying causes noted. The Japanese Government, of course, knows that neither the President nor the Congress nor the Supreme Court, nor all three combined, can make effective regulations of the public schools of San Francisco; the Japanese people, however, not only do not know that, but, we suspect, do not wish to be informed and in any case would not believe it. They occupy the position of a well-equipped pugilist seeking anything rather than trouble, but not averse to insult demanding as an expression of resentment a demonstration of strength and skill. The wise and pacific Japanese Government is probably strong enough to withstand the present stress, but it is only a question of time, to our mind, when pretexts for strife will become irresistible and it is for this particular reason, overshadowing all others combined bearing upon relationship with European Powers, that we feel the necessity of maintaining a masterful navy, not quite as a safeguard, but rather as insurance against possible incendiarism. So long as ten years ago the present

Tsar wrote to Prince Hohenlohe expressing his admiration of and liking for the Japanese; "but," almost pathetically as now appears, he added, "this sympathy has not kept me from acting against them when they have gone too far." Despite the apparently keen perception of possibilities implied in this absurdly complacent declaration, when the crisis came Russia was impotent from lack of preparation, and the results she experienced are not wisely to be ignored by even our own altogether peaceable though somewhat resourceful nation.

---

SATURDAY, *October 27.*

Long Live Elijah Pogram!

HOWEVER exasperating in the eyes of others we Americans have been, and continue to be perhaps in some respects, none will gainsay our exceptional contribution to the gayety of nations. If, for example, we had never cultivated the habit of bragging, how serious would have been the deprivation of our English cousins! It is with peculiar gratification, therefore, that we are enabled to note signs of a revival of what was beginning to seem to be a flagging interest in our traditional idiosyncrasies. Somewhat sadly, yet not without avidity, the discerning representative in this country of the "National Review" records his discovery that the eagle, so far from having completely lost his voice, is still a screamer. He finds his evidence in a recent political utterance of the most enthusiastic statesman of the Middle West, who, rising to the full requirements of oratory in urging the necessity of electing a certain candidate for the Congress, delivered himself of this eloquent and stirring peroration:

"The glorious American people, torch-bearers of Liberty; this American Republic, hope of the world; this American land, so nobly placed, so rich in all that ministers to human use and happiness; that people will not be corrupted by their prosperity, because their prosperity will be honest and pure; that Republic will not decay, because its Government will be kept close to that people; that land will not be spoiled and rifled by crazed efforts for hasty wealth, but made richer by intelligent industry and care. Development, not exploitation; progress, not decadence; while even brighter shines the light of the true freedom that men call 'equity before the law,' onward and upward, carried by the American millions as they press forward in the strength and joy of righteous living, passing by the gods of gold and leaving behind them the false worship of the broken idols of the market-place—a market cleansed, set in order and regenerated. So shall American civilization be made immortal and American institutions a blessing to mankind!"

To English ears, writes our solemn critic, this sounds ridiculous. "It is gasconade so absurd that one fails to understand how a prominent public man should be guilty of anything so childish, but the newspapers do not regard it as extraordinary, and I am sure the audience—and I speak with a long experience of American audiences—sat there spellbound, drinking in every word, thrilling in every emotion, believing all that they heard, and glorying in the thought that they were the chosen people." We dare say the audience chuckled; we are quite sure that we should if we had been there; and why not? Our national institutions are so few and our Elijah Pograms have become so rare since an inconsiderate Speaker effectually discouraged oratorical exhibitions in the House of Representatives that such a gush of pent-up emotion is more than welcome. Back go our memories to the happy days when the great General Choke was accustomed to speak to the visitor from a benighted monarchy such fervid words as these:

"You air, now, sir, a denizen of the most powerful and highly civilized do-minion that has ever graced the world; a do-minion, sir, where man is bound to man in one vast bond of equal love and truth. May you, sir, be worthy of your a-dopted country!"

Surely no true man could wish to expunge these noble sentiments from the fair pages of our glorious history or fail to rejoice in their occasional recrudescence. As we have already hinted, what cheer could we bestow upon our ancestral cousins if we should perfect the unhappy resemblance now partially existing? The oddity, also traditionally characteristic, lies in the inability of our self-contained relatives to perceive that one may derive genuine amusement from the exuberance of one's own verbosity. Unlike them, we have not yet acquired the remarkable capacity of always taking ourselves seriously.

Let us seize this opportunity to be frank and disabuse their minds! We should not like to have the admission repeated to the Latins or, above all, the Germans; but the fact, for family consumption, only, is that some of the assertions of our present-day Elijah are not quite true. We are a "glorious people," of course, and "torch-bearers of liberty" and the "hope" or prey of that portion of other communities considered undesirable at home; our land, too, is, if not "nobly," at least comfortably,

"placed" in comparative isolation and is really sufficiently fertile for all immediate necessities. We would not, however, insist very earnestly, except for purposes of oratory, that exploitation has yielded entirely to development, and we have given utterance to rather strong suspicions of late that the light of true freedom guaranteeing all men "equality before the law" is blazing somewhat less brightly than it might burn with propriety and usefulness. Nor are we absolutely certain that we have passed all of the gods of gold or broken the last of the idols of the marketplace, but the shattering process is well under way, and we are truly looking forward to a renewed experience at no distant day of the "joy of righteous living." Meanwhile, we beseech our ancestral relatives to be patient with us; we are young and crude, not hardened yet, as others are, even in sin—and we do love to hear ourselves talk because thereby, without irritating others unduly, we amuse ourselves at our own cheerful expense.

---

MONDAY, *October 29.*

For Woman Suffrage.

It was natural to expect, but is none the less gratifying to record, that the first and most earnest response to our proposal that the time has arrived when the interests of the country can be best conserved by conferring upon women the right to vote comes from our chief Western city. The "Chicago Evening Post" says plainly:

"The REVIEW takes a distinctly sane view of woman suffrage. Woman is fully equipped now to exercise the same political rights as man. Her exercise of these rights is essential to the welfare of the nation. She can vote with as much judgment and intelligence, and with much more moral responsibility, than man. Therefore, let her vote. She would fill public office as efficiently as man fills it; therefore, let her have the office.

"The country needs the vote of our women, it needs the morality of our women exercised in places of public trust. Give her the ballot, if she wishes to cast it; give her the office if she can win it."

The "Chicago Record-Herald" notes with satisfaction "A New Forward Impulse," and urges, as a matter of policy, that pleas be directed to women themselves in the hope of dispelling their apparent indifference. These are American newspapers of the highest type, and the value of their espousal of any worthy cause is inestimable. To others who advance the time-worn argu-

ment that women would not exercise such a privilege, it suffices to say that hundreds of thousands of citizens now qualified to vote seldom exercise their prerogative, but may be depended upon invariably in an emergency, such, for example, as now confronts the people of New York. Equal reliance, we firmly believe, might safely be placed upon women. In any case, assertion to the contrary is wholly speculative, in view of the fact that the condition has never arisen and the opportunity has never been accorded. The further objection, based upon a suspicion that universal suffrage would threaten the family relationship, we consider a mediæval notion, and no more sound than a theory that sons should not be permitted to vote lest they might not follow the lead of their fathers. These are days of enlightenment, independent action and individual responsibility, not of subjection of any portion of the human race morally and intellectually capable of exercising authority for the common good.

---

TUESDAY, *October 30.*

The Japanese in California.

THE opinion expressed positively by Macaulay, and echoed tentatively by other critical observers, that our written Constitution may eventually become an intolerable restriction and tend to our political undoing has never won very serious attention in this country; and yet the difficulties and embarrassments arising from its application to our rapidly widening relationships and responsibilities are so numerous already that reflection designed to effectuate a remedy is surely imperative. As a nation, no less than as a people, we unquestionably desire the firm establishment and the utmost possible extension of the principle of arbitration; but we are practically prevented by our fundamental law from assenting to most excellent proposals, such, for example, as will be presented to the Hague Conference.

We strongly dissent from the judgment expressed by a distinguished lawyer in this REVIEW to the effect that the United States is "morally responsible" for debts incurred and subsequently repudiated by individual States on the ground that such liabilities "were contracted by governments organized and sustained by the direct action of Congress," because we hold the reverse to be the fact, namely, that the Congress itself is but the creature of the thirteen original sovereign bodies and can exercise no authority beyond that recognized by the Supreme Court

as having been conferred upon it. Surely the Nation cannot be considered to have guaranteed in either a legal or a moral sense debts which it was known to have had no part in making, for the mere reason that they were contracted by political communities within its borders. Grant even that States exist by authority of the Federal Government; so do cities and townships and, for that matter, railway and industrial corporations, all of which have sold numberless bonds recognized by the purchaser as resting solely upon the mortgaged properties. We are unable to appreciate the risk, which our contributor considers to be involved, in agreeing to be bound by awards of the Hague Tribunal respecting public contracts, especially since the article providing therefor would surely take into account the sharp distinction between authorized National and unauthorized local obligations; consequently, we perceive no necessity for the application of the ingenious, though we suspect illegal, remedy which he suggests.

The pertinence, however, of his reference to the case of the Italians killed in New Orleans, as an illustration of our awkward inefficiency in dealing with other Powers, is obvious. The subterfuge to which the Federal Government was forced to resort, in that instance, to avert international difficulties, was not only humiliating to us, but unsatisfying to the complainants and wholly indeterminate as a precedent. Hence the present difficulty of the Administration in removing the causes of the dissatisfaction of the Japanese over the exclusion of their children from the public schools of California. The broader and more portentous aspects of this disagreeable situation we have already indicated; but the technical considerations cannot, in fairness, be ignored.

Japan and the United States are pledged by treaty to make no discrimination against their respective citizens in favor of those of other nations. Let us suppose that the American traders now transacting business in Nagasaki be subjected by the local governing body to a severe tax, from which their German competitors are exempted, that they make complaint to Washington, that our State Department remonstrate with the Japanese Minister of Foreign Affairs and receive a reply to the effect that authority to make such regulations rests exclusively in the prefecture of Kiushiu and that, consequently, His Majesty's Government is helpless. The parallel with the condition existing in California would be precise. True, the Emperor might and

doubtless would pledge his best endeavors to convince the honorable council of Kiushiu of the error of its ways, just as our President has promised to try to influence the constituted authorities of California and has given evidence of good faith by sending a Cabinet Minister, hat in hand, to beg the San Francisco Board of Education to kindly relieve the Federal Administration of embarrassment; but would the answer be altogether satisfying to our merchants or people generally?

Doubtless in this instance, as once before, our Supreme Court would hold that the treaty is the supreme law of the land and might even issue an order forbidding the San Francisco Board to violate its provisions, but if the Board should be obdurate there is no known way of enforcing such a decree. Altogether, the situation is curiously perplexing, and it would be ludicrous, but for a very real apprehension that, in the event of a failure of the President's appeal to public sentiment, it might become serious.

---

WEDNESDAY, *October 31.*

On the Eve of Election.

WE now see no reason to doubt that the Hearst force will experience a crushing defeat at the polls on Tuesday, November 6th. The canvass made by the radical candidate has been characterized by both shrewdness and audacity. Charges of inconsistency and insincerity made and substantiated by his antagonist he has calmly and cynically ignored, and has gradually narrowed his own claim to preferment to the assertion, probably correct, that large holders of property are arrayed solidly against him. To excite the masses against the classes has become in the latter days of the campaign his sole endeavor. How successful he has been will appear on the morning of November 7th. If his hopes should meet with the annihilation we anticipate, the result will be due to the recent arousal and conscientious action of conservative Democrats. No Republican campaign in years has been characterized by so great a measure of stupidity, beginning with unwise selections of Chairman and Treasurer of the State Committee, and ending we cannot tell where so long as opportunity to blunder remains. The original insistence that the issue was purely local was futile, depriving the Republican candidate until the very last of the efficient aid of such strong and respected statesmen as our two really great Cabinet Ministers. True, no questions of national party policy are involved, but the



Hearst force, as an issue, is distinctly national. It had its origin in California, is rampant in Illinois, has raised its head in the elections this autumn in Massachusetts, and loudly proclaims its intention of invading every section of the Union where unscrupulous journalism can be made efficacious. The real question to be decided next Tuesday is less whether the candidate of the force shall become Governor of New York, than whether the people of the Empire State shall set their seal of approval upon his aspirations to the Presidency. There was no question of this fact from the beginning, it was stated authoritatively and positively by the chief advocate of the force in this REVIEW. That the point should have been kept clearly before the public mind as the strongest that could be urged against the candidacy was plainly evident, and yet it has been practically ignored even by the Republican candidate himself, who in other respects has made an admirable and telling canvass. Nevertheless, the signs of the growth of a stern determination to preserve the State from disgrace seem unmistakable, and we would not be surprised to see the malign influence repudiated by a majority exceeding one hundred thousand.